

50-
POLYGAMY VERSUS CHRISTIANITY;

A

DISCOURSE AGAINST POLYGAMY,

AND

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

DELIVERED AT WATSONVILLE,

JUNE 14TH, 1857.

BY REV. ALFRED HIGBIE,

OF SANTA CRUZ, CAL.

SAN FRANCISCO:

PRINTED BY B. F. STERETT, PACIFIC OFFICE, 145 CLAY STREET.

1857.

PAJARO VALLEY, JUNE 23, 1857.

REV. A. HIGBIE,

Dear Sir :—The undersigned citizens of Pajaro Valley, who heard your discourse against Polygamy, delivered at Watsonville, June 14th, and believing that you ably exposed the moral pestilence, and successfully proved it to be unscriptural, unreasonable, and opposed to the best interests of society, would request you to permit the publication of that discourse, believing that good will be accomplished thereby.

Yours, &c.

THOS. B. POOL,
JAMES W. THRIFT,
B. W. MILES,
J. J. OSBORN,
JOSEPH LIVELY, M. D.,
WM. L. BROSIUS,
J. WISE,
J. D. CARR,
LEWIS A. SEE,
ALFRED DEVOE,
C. W. BILLINGS,
WM. H. GIBSON,
LEWIS J. PEARCE,

J. A. BLACKBURN,
R. H. CLEMENTS,
WM. N. ANDERSON,
THOS. SNODGRASS,
A. ROBERTS,
L. SANBORN,
WALT. C. LYNN,
ISAAO WILLIAMS,
THOS. D. ALEXANDER,
JOSHUA RAMSDELL, M. D.,
SAML. COMSTOCK,
ASA ALLEN.

SANTA CRUZ, JUNE 30, 1857.

Messrs. POOL, THRIFT, MILES, &c.,

Sirs :—Yours of the 23d inst., asking the publication of my discourse against polygamy, is before me. In reply, I would say, if its repetition will be productive of good, I am not unwilling. And believing the twenty-five petitioners above, competent to judge in this matter, I cheerfully consent to its publication.

Yours, &c.

A. HIGBIE.

SERMON.

MATH. 19—4 & 5. And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female; and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

The circumstances of the occasion demand of me a few remarks before I proceed to my subject. Several occurrences combine to produce in me feelings of the deepest solemnity. You will recollect that four weeks ago this day, I preached a sermon from these words—"Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatever a man soweth that shall he also reap."—Gal. 6., 7; in which I endeavored to "vindicate the Bible and its doctrines, in opposition to the Golden Bible or Book of Mormon, and the doctrines and principles recognized and taught by its advocates.

Our Mormon neighbors heard that discourse, and though it was not prepared or delivered in the spirit of controversy, they asked and obtained liberty to reply. You are the judges as to whether my discourse, or that attempt at a reply, corresponded with the Christian spirit and the spirit of argumentation.

In the *Western Standard* of May 22d, which I now hold in my hand, in an article on "Mormonism in Watsonville," are several statements derogatory to my discourse and the circumstances attending, among which I find this: "The discourse though carefully prepared was unusually flat and stale." C. T. Garvey purports to be the author. I presume you are satisfied as to the real author.

In every attempt to present their principles in their true light—which they themselves requested—the Mormons cry "*persecution!*"

Four weeks ago I announced that I would preach on "Baptism for the Dead and Polygamy;" and instead of preaching upon one subject in the morning and the other in the evening, as I intended, circumstances have led me to combine them. You will therefore be prepared for two Scripture passages as the basis of my remarks upon each topic.

Without further remarks, I shall come immediately to the consideration of the text just read.

My text is a reply to the tempting Pharisees, who wished to entangle Christ in his talk, and hence asked him if it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, or sin? Supposing that his answer, let it be positive or negative, would conflict with one of the *two* philosophical schools then among the Jews.

The one (Shammai) held that a man could not legally divorce his wife except for adultery; the other (Hillel) held that a man might put away his wife for a multitude of causes, if she did not find grace in his sight; that is when he saw any other woman that pleased him better. By answering the question, not according to either of these schools, but from Moses, our Lord defeated their malice and confounded their devices. When silenced by a quotation from their own law, they propounded another question, hoping to entangle him in his next answer. Hear Christ's answer, and their second question: "And he answered and said unto them, have ye not read, that he who made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder. They say unto him: Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and put her away? Christ said unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the *beginning* it was not so. Whosoever therefore, shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away doth commit adultery." The lesson taught by Christ in these passages is, that in the beginning, when God made Adam and Eve, and when that divine union (marriage) was accomplished by the Divine will, that they were made and united male and female, not

females, according to the Latter Day doctrine ; and that the original intention and design of God, in reference to the marriage relation, was never changed under the Law, or the Old Testament, and we find the same doctrine taught by Christ and his apostles. Hence, according to our understanding of the Scriptures, polygamy is not taught.

As I have said before, I enter upon the discussion of this question, not in the spirit of controversy, though others would wish to make it thus appear, and that it is also a spirit of persecution ; but with a desire for the development of truth ; and shall endeavor to move kindly, firmly, and yet fearlessly forward.

The great and filthy mass of polygamy has been thrown immediately in our way, and its devotees *daring* us to touch it. Were it not thrown immediately in our path, and could we pass undisturbed in that path, we would not touch, turn over, or move the thing that is such a stench in the nostrils of enlightenment, virtue and religion. But it is thrown before us, guarded by several stations or forts, containing several *drilled* soldiers, with a few small guns. My object shall be, to-day, to march directly up to these forts—take them, and not only show you of what poor material they are made, but show you the hideous mass of corruption they are set to guard. We go not forth because we are *dared*, but because it is thrown immediately in our way, and we wish to move steadily forward in the path of duty.

On the *first* of these forts we find written this inscription : *

The glory of the man will be in proportion to the number of wives and children he has. Through this thin and specious covering we can look within, and there read the denial of the great doctrines of the Bible and Christianity.

Here is ascribed to polygamy what alone can be ascribed to the death and merits of Christ. Hear what Paul says—(2 Cor. 4, 17,) "For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." He again says—(Col. 1 : 27,) with reference to the mystery of godliness, "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ in you the hope of *glory*." Again in the Acts of the Apostles—(4 : 11 & 12,) it is said "This is the stone which was set at nought by you

* These inscriptions are some of the theories of polygamists.

builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other ; for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

These quotations show clearly and conclusively the incorrectness of the inscription on the *first* fort, and the tendency of the doctrine there inculcated. This point then is taken without the loss of a man, and its interior, *real* character, laid open before you.

We now approach the *second* fort, on which we find this inscription—" *No single person, either male or female, can ever enter into the kingdom of heaven.*" To approach *this* fort with the implements of Biblical warfare, is to take it. When touched by divine truth, it falls by the weakening influence of its own principles. Let me bring divine truth to bear upon this inscription.

Isa. (45 : 32) says : "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth : for I am God and there is none else." The Saviour, (in Math., 11 : 28,) taking up the theme of prophecy, declares its fulfilment in the following touching language. "Come unto me, *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here it is expressly said *all* persons may be saved. Therefore *single* persons may be saved ; and hence the doctrine that "no single person can enter into the kingdom of heaven," is contrary to the plain teachings of God's word, and untrue. This point having been successfully taken, we move forward. But what do we behold !

Lo, and behold ! a *third* fort, with this inscription—" *Polygamy justified by the Bible.*" Before I proceed to the investigation of Scripture passages with reference to this doctrine, I shall briefly review Parley P. Pratt's "Scriptural evidences in support of polygamy."

He says, (page 5.) "They (all people) are as much bound to believe it, (polygamy) as any other principle of the gospel of Christ, and they can no more reject it (polygamy) than the belief in Jesus, repentance, and baptism ; there being (page 4) as great an abundance of Scriptural testimony to substantiate it as any other principle of the gospel." Just as if *polygamy* was a principle of the gospel.

These words cannot be misunderstood. Yet on the same and next page, he contradicts his own statement. Hear him : "Though we cite the testimony of the Scriptures, to convince mankind that this principle *was* correct, and its constitution was the one which

the Lord revealed, yet it is not upon this evidence that we presume to practice it at the present time, and wish it *distinctly understood*, that it is not for the purpose of teaching the practice of polygamy that we publish these evidences in its favor." That is to say, the plain and distinct teachings of the Scriptures do not recognize the practice of polygamy.

"A belief in the doctrine of polygamy," says he, "is as necessary and essential as the belief in Jesus, repentance, and baptism; and yet it is not upon this Scripture evidence that we presume to practice it." It therefore follows, according to his own reasoning, that though the Scriptures teach us to believe in Jesus, in repentance and baptism, "yet" we should not presume "to practice these," or act upon a Scriptural belief. What is this but saying, though we believe in polygamy, yet the Scriptures do not recognize or teach its practice. How contradictory, how confused, how absurd. Plainly saying he would not practice the plain-gospel teachings. Plainly saying the Scriptures justify polygamy, and that they should be *believed* in this as implicitly as in any other doctrine, and yet not practice upon that belief.

In his feeble attempt to support polygamy from the Bible, he tears down the whole Christian fabric upon which he professes to stand. According to their own showing, therefore, polygamy should not be practiced. Hear this Mormon Solon once more—(page 5,) "Whenever this system is practiced under the *divine sanction* of the Almighty, it will be by his direct command, and He will undoubtedly reveal the laws by which its observance will be governed! Until this command was given, though the Scriptures taught the doctrine of polygamy, and God's people practiced it, the Latter Day Saints never dared to adopt it."

Being closely pressed at this point, our hero endeavors to make his escape, but is captured in the very attempt. Here is a distinct admission that no laws exist justifying and governing polygamy. But that these "*undoubtedly WILL BE REVEALED when practiced under the divine sanction.*" These laws, therefore, "*will*" not "*be revealed*" till polygamy "is practiced under the divine sanction." Query. How are we to know when "polygamy is practiced by the divine sanction," inasmuch as our author cannot justify polygamy from the Scriptures, even according to his own showing; and that these laws cannot be revealed until (when) or after polygamy "is" already "practiced under the divine sanction."

In *The Mormon* of January 31, 1857, to which Parley P. Pratt contributes,—in a short account of the faith of Mormons, it is stated :

"We believe in the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and in living and continued revelation; *but we also believe that no new revelation will contradict the old.*"

Now let me lay the doctrines and *new revelations* of Parley P. Pratt, in his "Scriptural evidences in support of polygamy," by the side of the "*old*" revelation, "*The Book of Mormon*," printed at Nauvoo, Illinois, A. D. 1840, and see how they compare, or rather how they conflict. It says :

"And now I make an end of speaking unto you concerning this pride; and were it not that I *must speak unto you concerning a grosser crime*, my heart would rejoice exceedingly because of you. But the word of God burdens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord, *this people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the Scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredom, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son.* Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, *which thing was abominable before me*, saith the Lord; wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I the Lord God *will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old.* Wherefore, my brethren hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: *for there shall not any man among you have, save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none:* For I the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women; and whoredoms are an abomination to me: Thus saith the Lord of hosts. Wherefore this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes. For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken unto these things. For behold I, the Lord, have seen the sorrow, and heard the mourning of the daughters of my people in the land of Jerusalem; yea, and in all the lands of my people, *because of the wickedness and abominations of their husbands.* And I will not suffer, saith the Lord of hosts, that the cries of the fair daughters of this people, which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem, shall come up unto me, against the men of my people, saith the Lord of hosts; for they shall not lead away captive the daughters of my people, because of their tenderness, save I shall visit them with a sore curse even unto destruction; *for they shall not commit whoredoms, like unto them of old, saith the Lord of hosts.*"—Page 124.

Out of their own mouths let them be condemned! Tried by their own code, the Lord of Hosts must "visit them with a sore curse, even unto destruction."

What contradictions! What absurdities! "'Tis not in folly not to scorn a fool and scarce in human wisdom to do more." You have already discovered that this dodger endeavored to escape from the Bible point, and take shelter under the *new revelations* as the Mormons would have us believe, of Joseph Smith; but that was anticipated and his retreat entirely cut off four weeks ago, when I showed, and I hope satisfactorily too, that the Book of Mormon was *not a divinely inspired book*. Though this, the great Mormon champion, has rendered it unnecessary according to the plain rule of argumentation, both by positive declaration and

clear implication, that the Scriptures do *not* teach the practice of polygamy, for me to enter upon the consideration of Scripture texts on this subject; yet it may be expected that I consider the subject still further.

The Mormons start out with the *assumption* merely, without offering one word of proof, "that a plurality of wives was necessary for the multiplicity of our species and the increase of families and nations."

This we flatly deny. It cannot be proved.

It is assumed that God gave Hager to Abram for a wife! (Gen. 16: 1, 2, 3, &c.) God had no more to do with this than he had with the death of Joseph Smith. Assumption is not evidence.

It is said, v. 3, that Sarai took Hager, her maid the Egyptian, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his wife. This then is Sarai's act and not the Lord's. This act of hers grew out of two things:

1. A great desire on the part of Hebrew woman to have children, and
2. Her maid or servant, was the absolute property of the mistress, not only her person, the fruits of her labor, but also her children. Children, therefore which were born of the servant, were considered as the children of the mistress.

It was on this ground that Sarai gave her servant or maid to Abram; and we find, what must necessarily be the consequence in all cases of polygamy, that strifes and contentions took place.

When Abram saw that Sarai was despised and displeased he returned Hager to her. And Sarai dealt so hardly with her that she was compelled to flee for safety. While thus cast out and forlorn, God had respect to her in her sad condition. She is now addressed by the angel of the Lord, not as Abram's wife, but as "Sarai's maid," telling her that the son she should bear would be a wild man. [Wonder if there is any relation between Ishmael and the children of modern polygamists.] That his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him. The Ishmaelites, descendants of this wild man, (who are the Bedouins and wandering Arabs,) range the mountains for pasture—making the wilderness their habitation, where they pitch their tents. The Mormons contend that the angel's words to Abraham, saying "Abraham shall surely become a mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him," apply as well to Ishmael as

to Isaac, the child of promise. This is a fatal mistake. (See Gen. 17 chap., 18, 19, 20 & 21 vs., also, 21 chap., 9, 10, 11 & 12 vs.)

The remarks I have made with reference to Hagar, Sarai and Abaam, apply with equal force to Keturah and Abram, so far as the gift of God is concerned. Keturah was no more the gift of God to Abram, than Brigham Young's concubine No. 82, was a gift of God to him. That polygamy and concubinage were practiced under the Old Testament dispensation no one will deny; but that they were practiced by the command of God, or that they were *sanctioned* by Him, any farther than a *permission* sanctions an act, we do deny.

It is said, God *permitted* them, therefore they were right. This is bad logic for their cause. God *permitted* the wickedness of Lot and his daughters; and ten thousand other vile acts, even by those who were called to sacred offices, therefore these evil deeds were right—allowing the logic to hold good.

Those holding this foolish view, say polygamy is justified by the following passage: "If he (the husband) take another wife, her food, her raiment and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish." Ex. 21: 10. The argument is plainly this: If he take a wife he shall do thus and so; this is permitted by God, therefore it is right. Let us see. A subsequent verse [20] says: "If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished." If God allows him to smite his servant, &c., therefore it is right. Let me carry this a little further: To smite a servant or maid unto death is wrong. This cannot be denied. God permits him to do wrong. Whatever God permits is right; therefore it is right to do wrong: hence it was wrong that he should be punished. We can see by this to what fatal consequences such a course of reasoning will lead us.

This passage then, is not only not with them but against them.

Carrying this principle still further, I can prove that Brigham Young should serve or labor 350 years for his harem; and I judge he would count that unrighteous.

Again, it is said God commended polygamy in the case of Jacob, Leah, Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpha. If he commended polygamy in this instance, then he commended fourteen years labor for Leah and Rachel; then he commended Joseph's brethren in all their wickedness towards him; then he commended Cain in killing his brother; then he commended Pharaoh for his wickedness

towards the Hebrews while in Egypt ; then he commended the Jews in killing Christ.

There is no more of the Divine command for the one than for the other. A bare permission of an act neither proves a command for that act, nor a justification of the consequences.

Taking the position that a permission of an act is its justification, as some polygamists do, we shall be led to consequences fatal in the extreme. The apostles were persecuted from city to city, whipped and even put to death. This was permitted, and therefore right, and hence should be practiced now, which would lead to the persecution, whipping, and even putting to death, in the most ignominious manner, great and good men merely for preaching the everlasting gospel. Christ was born in a *manger*, in a *stable*. This was right, according to the position assumed, therefore mothers now should bear their children in a manger, in a stable. Children were circumcised then, therefore they should be circumcised *now*. It is intimated here, that times and circumstances have changed, and these things would not be proper now. In this very intimation polygamy is condemned, and their own argument turned against themselves.

If I should admit, merely for the argument, that polygamy was not only permitted but even *commanded* under the Old Testament dispensation, this would not help its advocates, unless they could prove its ratification, and consequent justification, under the New Testament dispensation ; but this they have *never* done, and never can do.

This will bring me to the New Testament view of the subject : I shall now more fully consider my text, with its references, and a few quotations from the Apostles. Christ, in my text, says : " At the beginning,"—referring these wicked Pharisees to their own law and the first marriage (Gen. 2., 24,) when God made them male and female, and not females, and " for this cause," viz : *one* male for one female, and *one* female for a male, for the propagation of the race in the true matrimonial relation instituted by God himself—" shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his *wife*"—not *wives*—" and they *twain*"—as Christ renders the Hebrew word in their law, which literally meant they *two* or *both* of them, and not they 10, 20, 30 or 50—" shall be *one* flesh."

Christ says unto them, though Moses *suffered* you through the hardness of your hearts, to have more than one woman and *suffer*-

ed you, when one wife became a little too old to suit you, to put her away, as is sometimes the case with polygamists of modern times, either by divorce, or what is worse, into some abode and servitude at once menial and wretched ; " but from the beginning it was not so."

Christ silences them at once, by referring these Pharisaic schemers to the *beginning* (Gen. 2: 24.) the first marriage and first marriage ceremony, viz : " This is flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone ; therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife ; and they (two) shall be one flesh." Though you and some of your ancestors were *permitted* by Moses, to put away your wives to save them from cruel treatment, and were *suffered* through the hardness of your hearts to have more than one woman, these were not practiced by Adam's family, neither were they in the original design or intention of the marriage relation. Christ virtually says, I condemn your wicked actions in these things and abrogate those Mosaic *permissions*, upon which you Scribes, Pharisees, Hypocrites and generation of vipers, would fix yourselves in your lustful inclinations.

The Apostle Paul taking up this subject says (1. Cor 7: 2) : " Let every man have his own wife (not wives) and let every woman have her own husband," i. e., let every man have *one* woman, *his own* ; and every woman one man, *her own*. Here plurality of wives is most *emphatically* forbidden.

Again the same Apostle says to his Ephesian brethren, (Eph 5. 30 and 31.) referring to the original marriage ceremony " We are members of His body, of his flesh and of his bones," and then referring his brethren to the answer Christ gave the Pharisees, continues,—" For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, (not wives,) and they *two* shall be one flesh." And as if to add force to the argument already presented, the Apostle institutes a comparison between the church and Christ ; v. 32., and the man and wife ; showing that the church was one, one faith, one hope, one baptism, and that *that* church was the *Lamb's* (or Christ's) wife ; thereby showing a oneness of the husband and wife ; and then, keeping the principles already stated, before them, says, " husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church," not churches, " and gave himself for it." How happy must those *twain* be who have regarded the principles of monogamy, or the original marriage relation of *one*

man to one woman, in opposition to the principles of polygamy.

I think you have not failed to keep in view the great fort of polygamy No. 3, on which was written—*Polygamy justified by the Bible!* You did not fail to see the mode of attack, and the implements of warfare—"The word of God which is the sword of the Spirit, and mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds." You did not fail to discover the fact, that while we were quiet within our own camp, the enemy from this fort fired across our bow and into our camp, long before any reply was made. Neither did you fail to see us bring up the artillery of Divine truth, and bring it to bear upon this fort, which was like the ancient sepulchres "fair without, but within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness," as Christ said. You beheld, on the one hand, this fort with its blazing inscription, and its *drilled* soldiers in battle array; on the other, the party that *dared* to stand in self-defence. You now anxiously wait the issue. Silence reigns! Nothing is heard save the beatings of the heart produced by the excitement of the occasion. And now the silence is broken. The commander of the fort orders his men to *fire!* With eager eyes, you turn to those who *dared* defend themselves, to witness the results. When, lo! you found that not a single arrow had reached them. You now anxiously wait a reply. And now the artillery already referred to opens a fire with terrific effect. You look for the fort with its blazing inscription, and the men placed to defend it, and lo! it is tumbling to the ground, pieces flying in every direction, and the men endeavoring to make their escape to their wives and concubines, but having now no place of defence, are obliged to surrender themselves prisoners of war.

The battle is now over—the last fort has been taken, and we shall be able to look with clearer vision upon that filthy mass thrown in our way, and have a clearer view of the interior of Mormonism.

All this time you have been anxious to know what could be seen and learned, provided the forts set for the defence of Mormonism could be taken. As you have witnessed the taking of the last fort, I now ask you near to see and learn.

You behold and wonder! And now you begin to inquire,—*"What is that strange looking thing—and that—and that—and THAT——!"* and turning your eyes to the other side, you exclaim: *"Yon hideous thing, what is it—and it—and it?"* If you can wait

patiently a few moments I will tell you. This is in accordance with a specific request made publicly four weeks ago. If these answers appear "*unusually flat and stale*" to our polygamous neighbors, I cannot help it. I am aware that all the facts stated will be denied. But this will not help the case. A denial in Court does no good. I will notice:

1. *The SPIRITUAL WIFE Doctrine!*

So abhorrent is the vice of polygamy to every enlightened sentiment of human nature, so repugnant is it to all that is elevating and ennobling in social existence, that even the leaders of Mormonism have been compelled to veil its evident enormity under some specious garb of religious character; and consequently term it the *Spiritual wife* doctrine. Latter day polygamy and spiritual wife doctrine had their sole origin in the lust and sensuality of the founder of Mormonism. Did religion need these? Verily no! Why then instituted? Evidently to minister to the lusts of the leaders of the imposture. The "*Spiritual Wife*" doctrine is based on two principles: 1st. "That the kingdom of the saints is to consist solely of their own posterity, and that thus, the more wives a man has the more heirs of glory will be born." 2d. "The marriage of a woman to one of the saints, by which she becomes sealed to him, is her own surest passport to heaven!" That those who have attained to this position, are no more under obligations to their husbands if they have them, and that it is their privilege to leave their lawful husband and take another. These facts are testified to by four credible witnesses—Mr. H. Brotherton, Mr. Shindle, J. M. G. Van Dusen and M. Van Dusen.—(Hist. Mormonism.)

Again: It is stated on the evidence of B. G. Ferris, once Secretary of U. T., in his "*Utah and the Mormons*," "That one Watt, on his way to Salt Lake City, accompanied by his half-sister, determined to signalize their advent among the saints by being married. For this purpose they repaired to Brigham; but no sooner had the lecherous impostor set eyes on her, than he instantly conceived the plan of possessing her himself. He said he had great scruples about *sealing* people who were so nearly related; but that he would seal her to *himself*. They were compelled to yield. But they devised a plan by which there might be an unsealing of the ceremony. In a few days Brigham became

tired of her, and informed Mr. Watt that he had obtained a new revelation upon the subject, and that they might now be *sealed*. And they were sealed by Brigham on the spot." Here polygamy and incest were ratified in a few days.

But the "Order of Cloistered Saints," is the *Spiritual wife doctrine*, one circle removed towards the centre of the Mormon Temple. This is given by the same author just quoted.

"Whenever an apostle, elder, or high priest has conceived a lustful attachment for any female, and finds a reciprocal attachment, he asks Brigham to inquire of the Lord whether it would be right for him to make his *inamorata* his spiritual wife. If he is in the good graces of Brigham, he invariably gets an affirmative answer, though these parties already have husbands and wives. Accordingly the parties are married secretly in the Temple; and the parties are themselves bound to future secrecy in reference to the marriage and no outward or public change in the life of the spiritual wife is observable. Still she lives with her lawful spouse. But the unscrupulous pair, *sealed* in the recesses of the Temple, meet secretly from time to time." This was the case with Wells who had six wives, one being his sister-in-law, who was a married. The marriage bond in relation to this Sister in law and her husband was dissolved by Young and she added to the seraglio of this blackhearted Wells. Thus the dissolution of the marriage bond, incest, adultery and polygamy were recognized and ratified by that wicked despot Brigham Young. These are the practical workings of such heathen nations. I know the Mormon leaders attempt to deny these facts. This only adds insult to injury. I must now pass from this unscriptural, unnatural and heathenish doctrine to consider:

2. *That the marriage of a woman to a saint is her surest passport to heaven!*

This doctrine is so monstrous that the Mormon leaders dare not publish it to the world and therefore deny it when it is published. But this is stated on the evidence of the four witnesses already referred to. This doctrine at once makes Christ second at the least, in the great plan of salvation; and polygamy, or spiritual wife doctrine, which is the "Order of Cloistered Saints," the *first*; for this union is the surest passport to heaven. Christ says "no man cometh to the Father but by me." But the spiritual polygamists

say no—her surest passport to heaven is her union to a Mormon !
What blasphemy ! what ignorance ! and what tendencies.

3. They say :

Christ had three wives—Mary, Matha and the other Mary, whom Jesus loved ! For a refutation of this vile calumny, I only need mention his own teachings and the teachings of the apostles, to which I have already referred.

4. They assert that “ *God himself was married, or how could he beget his son Jesus Christ ?—that he had, nobody knows how many wives and concubines. That every spirit has its father and mother.*” These doctrines, too, will be denied by the Mormon leaders, outside of Salt Lake. But I refer you to the Deseret Almanac for 1853, and Deseret News, Dec. 25, 1852, for the verification of these facts. The necessary tendency of a belief in the doctrines just stated, leads them to another unscriptural, unnatural, and *Latter Day* doctrine, viz : *Christ was begotten in the heavens, and born on earth of one of God's terrestrial” concubines !”* See Deseret News, again.

This is Mormonism as it is.

It is also asserted by those who are familiar with the Mormon community as it now exists in Utah, (See Ferris on Utah and the Mormons,) that the vast majority of women who, in that community, are the 2d, 10th, or 20th wives of the Saints, are adventurers from the States, who have already been unfortunate in their marriage relations at home ; women who have been divorced from their husbands for various, and sometimes for no very innocent causes, and have turned Mormons solely to improve their temporal condition. Another class of female pilgrims who swarm toward the habitation of the Saints, are those whom imprudence and vice, and sometimes slander and enmity, have bereft them of their reputation in their original homes. To aid them in their pursuit of imaginary happiness, the Mormon theory teaches that every Magdalen who is baptized, even though she had been possessed of seven devils, from that moment becomes pure and regenerated, and commences a new and transformed life. A late United States Secretary for Utah testifies, that in a village on Utah Lake, “ he saw a man, his two wives, and a full grown daughter lodge in the same room, containing two beds. which room served the purposes

of parlor, kitchen and bedroom." He adds, with much truth: "that a dozen women, the common property of one man, seven of them divorced from other men, and lodging under the same roof, and in the same room, soon begin to feel that they might as well be the common property each of a dozen men."

AGAIN. *The Vulgarly of Mormonism as it is.*

In a speech against the Gladdenites, a faction of the Mormon community, Brigham Young asserted that their leader was a "nasty, stinking apostle—that the nasty little smith and his wife would go to hell across-lots; and that they wore nasty stinking ribbons," &c. &c. In another speech against the healing art, and physicians, he said, "I know, as well as the doctors, that women have legs, bellies," &c. I could quote more—both from Brigham and Phelps the editor of the *Desert Almanac*, but it is too indecent. This vulgarity was uttered in the temple, to a congregation of 8,000 people of both sexes. We would not bring the crimson to your cheek, we would not be guilty of repeating his vulgarities, but to show you, from his own language, what the refinement of Brigham Young and Phelps, and scores of others is—and what Mormonism is; and repel the falsehood found in the statement—"That their doctrines, teachings and practices are pure, chaste and elevating."

I have taken you to a few of those *things* which you discovered in the Mormon camp after the demolition of the last fort, and about which you wished information. Your interrogatories have been briefly, but I hope satisfactorily answered. Your next and natural inquiry is—

"What is the tendency of all these?"

To this point I invite attention for a few moments. These principles and notions referred to tend—

1. *To Domestic Discord and Unhappiness.*

Polygamists do not pretend to maintain one general household, properly organized, and governed by the constant presence of the father and head; but their wives and concubines are frequently scattered about, in two, three or four different abodes, like so many mistresses, whom these sanctimonious debauchees visit at the behest of passion. By this process they tell us they diminish licentiousness and impurity. "In the same way, they have only, by a law of their own creating, to legalize forgery, perjury, bur-

glary, larceny and murder, and then would the millennial day dawn upon the world—then would crime be unknown, and every man become blameless." The Mormons point with great boasting to the great number of magnificent as well as squalid abodes of immodest women found in cities where monogamy prevails, saying that no such things appear among them. But the only real difference which exists between the two cases is this: "That these polygamists commit fornication, adultery and incest with the protection of a law of their own formation; while in the other case, the other crimes are committed secretly, under the ban of the law, and under heavy penalties, which very frequently overwhelms the miserable offenders." In this case the advantages are manifestly on the side of the monogamist. The practical results of a polygamous faith then, as facts clearly show, are fornication, licentiousness, and even the dissolution of the marriage vow, to reach these ends. Can such principles and practical workings as these obtain in a harem and not produce *domestic disorder and unhappiness*? As soon as the Saint introduces the second wife into his household, the real affection of the first, if it still exists, is destroyed; she hates her rival as one who has trespassed on her rights, in violation of every law of Scripture, reason and decency. And what is the result? *Domestic unhappiness*. "The wives quarrel about the supremacy; they quarrel about their children; they quarrel about their husband;—they quarrel about every thing." Nor is it possible for things to be otherwise, under these controlling influences, as long as human nature remains as it is. The first wife, if she have any decency and delicacy of soul, soon pines away under some vaunting concubine, and "does not live out half her days." "Sad, complaining, unloved and neglected, she sinks into a premature grave, the victim of hypocritical, sanctimonious but legalized lust."

Death itself would, almost, be preferable to the continuance of a relation which has only become a source of uninterrupted wretchedness. This being the case with the mothers, what must be the condition of the children? Under the Mormon code polygamy filial affection cannot, *does not* exist. Here the most intense jealousies are generated, and become as complicated and extensive as they are intense. The begotten principles now take from. The children now dislike and disobey their mothers, step-concubines and father; and know not the endearing title of *brother* and

sister, because these distinctions are necessarily lost. This is the practical result of a polygamous faith. These the fatal tendencies.

Still farther. Already, many of the younger wives of the "Saints," disgusted with the developments and incidents of a polygamous life, have run away; and have preferred to marry the nobler half-breeds and Indians—the Pottowotamies and Sioux, where the presence of one wife in the household restores to her something of the unity and affection of the marriage state. This statement, of course, will also be denied—the Mormon mode of argument. But, to substantiate what I have said, I refer you to Lieut. Gunnison's Latter Day Saints. This, though they may dare to deny, they cannot disprove.

These principles tend to the sale of daughters to be wives and concubines of some old "Saint." Practice—Two fair daughters were sold by an unnatural father, to an ungodly "Saint," for a wagon and fixtures, and compelled to leave their father's home, and go to the house of the "Saint" though they hated him with a perfect hatred. But to flee would be to be brought back to the sealing altar dead or alive. This is but one instance in many, in which daughters are unnaturally and improperly treated. These principles tend—

2. To the Destruction of all Family Distinctions.

Here is a family—if you can call it a family—of a mother, two sisters and a daughter, all wives of a Mormon "Saint," and all mothers. Now what relation are these to one another, to their husband and their children? No genealogist can tell. Follow these for a few years, and you will find this genealogical paradox, viz: They are related to many, and yet cannot specify their real ancestry, or true family relation. Parents become mixed with parents, children doubly mixed with children, and grand-children trebly mixed with grand-children. It is, in short, breaking up the whole domestic relation. You look upon this want of family identity and distinctness and say, "What is this? and what has produced it?" This is Mormonism—and polygamy has produced it. Now, with such principles and their legitimate tendencies as are before us, can we look for—

3. Moral Purity and Social Refinement?

We may look, but all in vain! We find them not. They are not the parts of such a body.

Hear Brigham Young, touching this moral purity and social refinement, in one of his sermons in the temple, the practical working of Mormon theology. He says, "men ought to die for transgressing the law of God."

"Let me suppose a case," says he: "Suppose you found your brother in bed with your wife, and put a javelin through both of them, you would be justified, and they would atone for their sins, and be received into the kingdom of God." "I would at once do so in such a case," says he, "and under such circumstances, I have no wife whom I love so well that I would not put a javelin through her heart, and would do it with clean hands."

The remarks by President J. M. Grant, Sunday, Sept. 21, 1856, as reported in *The Desert News*, are to the same effect, as follows:

"I say there are men and women that I would advise to go to the President immediately, and ask him to appoint a Committee to attend to their case; and then let a place be selected, and let that Committee shed their blood.

"We have those among us who are full of all manner of abominations—those who need to have their blood shed; for water will not do—their sins are of too deep a dye.

"And we have women here who like any thing but the celestial law of God; and if they could break asunder the cable of the Church of Christ, there is scarcely a mother in Israel but would do it this day. And they talk it to their husbands, to their daughters, and to their neighbors, and say they have not seen a week's happiness since they became acquainted with that law, or since their husbands took a second wife. They want to break up the Church of God, and to break it from their husbands and family connections.

"We have been trying long enough with the people; and I go for letting the sword of the Almighty be unsheathed, not only in word, but in deed.

"I go in for letting the wrath of the Almighty burn up the dross and the filth; and if the people will not glorify the Lord by sanctifying themselves, let the wrath of the Almighty God burn against them, and the wrath of Joseph and Brigham and Heber and of high Heaven."

I would say to Brigham and Grant, as Nathaniel said to David, Thou art the men.

Again. He says, speaking of the actions of wickedness in high places, practical Mormonism—"They give way to wickedness, and outrage the feelings of those who are truly moral. Many of our boys who play in the streets, and use profane language, know not what they are doing; but there are old men, members of the High Priests' Quorum and of the High Counsel, who, when they get in difficulty, or are perplexed, will get angry and swear and curse at every thing around them. I will assure you that I could find High Priests who conduct in this manner."

Of these and also others who will not walk up to the Mormon dictum, he says—"These poor, miserable, lying, swearing, cursing and pilfering curses, who prowl around and serve the devil, ought

to be whipped, so that they would remember it till death." Here we have the practical theology of Mormonism as taught by the man whom the Mormons dare not disobey—whose word is the end of the law. Here you have an exhibit of the moral purity and social refinement of the people whose leader dare use such profane and vulgar language in the place where refined and Christian language only should be used.

The tendencies of these principles and practices are the same in the body political, as in the domestic circle. They carry the very seeds of discord and dissolution in themselves. Their assumptions and dictations are paramount to the *laws that be*. The only law to a Gentile, among them, is the order of Gov. Young. Mormon juries have been forbidden to give a verdict of conviction. Life would be unsafe to gainsay the supreme dictations of Brigham Young.

With all these facts before us we might look for a secret oath-bound organization in the church, acknowledging no law save the law of the holy Priesthood, which comes to the people through Brigham Young.

Following this, we might look for a band of men, under the direction of the church, to take the lives of those who might question the mandate of Brigham Young. This would lead us to expect that the Federal Officers of the Territory might be insulted, harrassed and annoyed. And then again, we might expect to hear the American Government, with its officers, from the President down, vilely slandered and abused. Then as a climax, we might expect a policy of outrageous oppression fettering the minds and gagging the mouths of the people—allowing neither liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of elections, liberty of enterprise or liberty of removal. All these, I say, are the legitimate tendencies of Mormonism as it is. All these things then, the close observer of cause and effect, might expect to look for. Have these expectations been realized? All these enormities really been perpetrated? Would that I could say no! But I must refer you to their own witnesses, (for all these have been called on to testify in their favor,) Col. Steptoe; Mrs. Ferris; B. G. Ferris, late Secretary of Utah Territory; Lieut. Gunnison; John Hyde, now the apostate; W. W. Drummend, Chief Justice of Utah Territory; Hon. G. P. Stiles, U. S. District Judge; T. S. Williams, Esq., and others cognizant to these facts, all of whom

testify to the perpetration of these and many other enormities. But the Mormon argument, to palliate these plain and distinct complaints, is in substance about this : These things are no worse than those perpetrated in many of the States, and therefore ought not to be condemned above others.

This may appear very fair upon its face, but here is the great difference and distinction—the one is the legitimate result of a dogma held, or a SELF established law, while the other is a direct violation of an extant and recognized law of the State, and is punishable by it. There is no parallel in the case.

I shall now proceed to show you that Mormonism tends to the
SUBVERSION OF REPUBLICANISM !

I call attention first, to the Report of Chief Justice Branderberry, Associate Justice Brocchus, and Secretary Ferris, for the Territory of Utah, to the President of the United States, Dec. 19, 1851, and printed in Executive Documents. Commencing on p. 8, document 25, of the report, it reads :

"We found upon our arrival that almost the entire population consisted of a people called Mormons; and the Mormon Church overshadowing and controlling the opinions, the actions, the property, and even the lives of its members, usurping and exercising the functions of legislation, and the judicial business of the Territory; organising and commanding the military; disposing of the public lands upon its own terms; coining money, stamped 'Holiness to the Lord,' and forcing its circulation at a standard fifteen or twenty per centum above its real value; openly sanctioning and defending the practice of polygamy, or plurality of wives; exacting the tenth part of everything from its members under the name of tithing, and enormous taxes from citizens not members; penetrating and supervising social and business circles; and inculcating and requiring, as an article of religious faith, implicit obedience to the counsels of the Church, as paramount to all the obligations of morality, society, allegiance, and of law."

"Our main reliance was upon Brigham Young, the Governor, for no man could govern them against his influence without a military force.

"We were informed afterwards, that Mr. Blair had made several private applications to the Governor, to know if he would allow an interview to the Chief Justice, but he refused, declaring that 'he did not wish an introduction, for none but Mormons, should have been appointed to the offices of the Territory, and none others, but d—d rascals would have come among them.'"

"The Governor rose to address the audience, and a profound silence ensued, as is always the case when he rises to speak. After reflecting in terms of condemnation upon the alleged hostility of Gen. Taylor to the Mormons, and to giving them a government, he exclaimed, in a loud and exulting tone, 'But Zachary Taylor is dead, and in hell, and I am glad of it.' Then drawing himself up to his utmost height, and stretching his hands toward heaven, he declared in a still more violent voice: 'And I prophecy in the name of Jesus Christ, by the power of the priesthood that 'is upon me, that any President of the United States, who lifts his finger against 'this people, shall die an untimely death, and go to hel'.' To this sentiment there came up from those seated around us, and from all parts of the house, loud and mingled responses of 'Amen!' 'Good!'"

Again. Hear the treasonable language of Grant, Kimball, Spencer, and Carrington, all high functionaries in the Mormon church :

"Upon the following Sunday, the Mayor of the city, Jedediah M. Grant, in eulogising the strength of the Mormons, exultingly declared from the pulpit, 'That now the United States could not conquer them by arms.' Brigham Young, the Governor, announced with great vehemence from the stand to the individuals, while the people were thus excited by such sentiments, 'that he ruled that people for

years, and could rule them again; that the United States Judges might remain in the Territory and draw their salaries, but they should never try a cause if he could prevent it.

"Another speaker, already referred to, standing second in the Church (Heber C. Kimball) encouraged by the example set him by the Governor, declared in a speech at a public meeting, 'that the United States officers might remain in the Territory so long as they behaved themselves, and paid their boarding; but if they did not, they (the Mormons) would kick them to hell; where they belonged.'

"The preacher, Prof. Spencer, 'of the University of Deseret,' among other expressions of ill-feeling, declared that 'the laws and policy of the United States Government were intended to oppress the poor;' and turning his eyes upon us, in the presence of this large audience, further declared: 'The Government of the United States is a stink in the nostrils of Jehovah, and no wonder the Mormons wish it down. We can save it by *theocracy*; but rather than save it any other way, we will see it d—d first.' Another Mormon (Albert Carrington) in refusing to join in firing a salute on the 4th of July, declared to Judge Brochus and others, 'that the United States was going to hell as fast as it could, and the sooner the better.'

Again. The following circumstance is testified to by more than forty credible witnesses:

Mr. W. Snow, Justice of the Peace, in Salt Lake City, while conducting the trial of Mr. John Galvin for striking a Mormon, said to him, (I use his own language,) "If you ever lay your hands on another Saint, I will have your head cut off before you leave the city. I thank God that the time is not far distant, and I shall rejoice when it comes, that I shall have the authority to pass sentence of life and death on the Gentiles; and I will have their heads snatched off like chickens in the barn-yard."

Again. Brigham Young, in one of his Sunday discourses, said—"That he was raising up a people who would, ere long, carry fire and sword to the very Capitol of the United States; that the Mormons would *meet any force sent by the United States, and bid them God-speed, with musket and grape-shot!* He said *he* was the law and order to the Mormon people; that he was elected Governor for life of the *State of Deseret*, and that no other one could or should govern that people, and that the United States might send whom they pleased as Governor, that they, the people, would not submit to any other Governor."

Hear him again: He declared that God had made *him* Governor, and that while he lived he should *govern*. That he was the "law and the order," and that "if any man stuck himself up above him, he would bring him down—*by the eternal Gods!*" That he was "not afraid of Mr. Justice, nor Uncle Sam, nor all hell!"

Dare they deny these statements? If they dare, they stand condemned, and deny their own documents.

As they cannot show these things untrue, without making their own documents teach falsehood, they stand condemned on the other hand.

So let them turn which way they may, they find themselves in condemnation. Dare they deny that they publicly endeavored to assassinate Judge McCabe, of Michigan? Dare they deny that Dr. Vaughn, of Des Moines, Iowa, was murdered by a high functionary in the church? Dare they deny that Mr. G. L. Turner,

formerly of Rob's Exchange, Sacramento, was cheated out of \$3,000 cash, then of his teams, and then, to get clear of him, chased by the Danites, with directions from headquarters to kill him wherever he might be found?

If such assertions and actions do not tend to subversion of Republicanism, then no treasonable act can tend to its subversion.

If such doctrines and principles do not strike at the very foundation of Republicanism, then no principles of an autocrat can.

If these principles, coupled with their legitimate results, do not strike at the foundation of Liberty and happiness, then theft, robbery, murder, licentiousness, forgery, blasphemy, incest, and hypocrisy do not.

I have endeavored to show that *Mormonism as it is*, is unscriptural, unreasonable, unnatural, unhealthful, and productive of individual, social and domestic unhappiness—producing physical, social and individual wretchedness.

I think I have shown that it strikes at individual and republican liberty; that it tends to depression of mind and spirits—to immorality, and consequently to irreligion, and hence to all those evils growing out of ungodliness.

I think I have shown you that this is contrary to the teachings of the Bible, and is only the result of a belief in a false revelation, or rather, no revelation at all; nothing but the conjurings of a perverted mind, and depraved moral sensibilities; and nothing but great ignorance and credulity can prompt any mind to receive and believe so much error and contradiction.

If we would seek moral elevation, mental and physical strength; if we would enjoy individual and social happiness; if we would cherish the endearing bonds of consanguinity, and recognize in our relationship, father, mother, brother and sister; if we would strengthen the bonds of civil and religious liberty; if we would elevate and bless the world; if we would properly elevate our daughters and wives to the position God designed them; if we would cherish the principles of chastity and purity; if we would cultivate paternal, maternal, filial and social affections, and bequeath to our kindred these great principles of individual, domestic and national happiness; if we would have our sons and daughters respect Divine truth, flee from error and consequent unhappiness; if we would love that which is lovely and hate that which is hateful; if we would be happy for time and happy for eternity,—then we must regard the Scriptures as the standard of Truth, and the only rule of human action, distinct, independent, far above and beyond all earthly productions—such as the Golden or Mormon bible: then must we repudiate all erroneous and dangerous doctrines necessarily growing out of all such earthly productions, which must, from their very nature, be as the apostle says, “earthly, and sensual, and devilish”: then must we receive the Bible, its pure doctrines, and the Christian religion as man's only real good, and reject Mormonism as the essence of error and evil.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

1 Cor., 15, 29. "Else what shall they do who are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?"

Joseph Smith makes this comment on this passage: "Every man who has got a friend in the eternal world can save him, unless he had committed the unpardonable sin; so you can see how far you can be a savior. There is a way to release the spirit of the dead; that is, by the power and authority of the priesthood—binding and loosing on earth—i. e. by this ordinance of baptism for the dead. Those saints who *neglect it*, in behalf of their deceased friends, *do it at the PERIL OF THEIR OWN SALVATION!*"

From these statements you can readily understand what is meant by

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

This may be defined as a *vicarious immersion* or "*baptism by proxy*," administered to *living persons* in behalf of their relations who have died unregenerate or unbaptised.

It must be remembered that this language was used in connection with the great doctrine of the resurrection. Dr. Clarke says: "The resurrection of our Lord was a grand theme among the apostles; they preached this as the *demonstration of the truth of the gospel*. All the converts to Christianity became so on the *evidence* of this resurrection. This resurrection was considered the *pledge* and *proof* of the resurrection of all believers in Christ, to the possession of the same glory into which he had entered. The baptism they received they considered as an emblem of their *natural* death and resurrection."

This doctrine St. Paul most pointedly preaches in these words: Rom. 6: 3, 4 & 5, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, even so we also should walk in newness of life: for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in his resurrection."

It is evident from this that all who died in the faith of Christ died in the faith of the *resurrection* also.

As so many of the primitive followers of Christ sealed the truth with their *blood*, and Satan and his followers continued unchanged,

every man who took on him the profession of Christianity, which was done by receiving *baptism*, considered himself as *exposing his life* to the most imminent hazard, and offering his life with those who had already laid down theirs. He was therefore *baptized* with reference to this martyrdom. As martyrdom and baptism were so closely connected, *to be baptized* was used to express *being put to a violent death*. The sum of the Apostle's meaning appears to be this: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, those who, in becoming Christians, expose themselves to all manner of privations, crosses, severe sufferings, and a violent death, can have no compensation, nor any motive sufficient to induce them to expose themselves to such miseries." Into this doctrine they were baptized. If they denied this doctrine they struck a blow at Christianity, and what could they do? What would be the consequence? The apostle plainly infers that if they held to Christianity at all, they must hold to *this* doctrine as a part of their profession. The plain and obvious meaning of the phrase "*for the dead*" then is—*with reference to the dead*, direct allusion to the condition of the dead, and their hopes; with a belief that the dead will rise again. The Apostle would say—Is there any reason why we should voluntarily submit to so many *sufferings*, and endanger our lives, if the dead rise not? On the conviction of the certainty of the resurrection we are thus baptized unto this doctrine, with reference to the condition of the dead.

St. Paul, in the use of this language, contending against the infidel objections, that "Christ rose not, neither will the dead arise," exclaims, appealing to the power of the Almighty, as the assurance of this hope—"else what shall they do who are baptised for (the resurrection of) the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for (or in hope of the resurrection of) the dead?" And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? If St. Paul really designed to teach the doctrine of baptism for the dead, he would have used quite different language from that employed in the text; for he always speaks with perspicuity and depth of thought. Let us look at the words of the text a little more closely.

"Else what shall they do *who* are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all."

If he had intended to teach the doctrine of the baptism for the dead in this interrogatory, he would have inquired—"What shall they do, or what will become of them *for whom* others have been baptized?" The phraseology of the text plainly shows, in connection with the great doctrine of the resurrection before their minds, that they were not baptized *unto*, *in*, or for the safety, happiness, or salvation of any departed spirit; but *to*, *into*, or for a principle or doctrine, which, though its profession might be a baptism *to*, *unto*, or *for* death, or the dead, would raise the baptized *to*, or *into*, or *for* these principles, or, in the language of the text, *for* the dead, and not the dead for whom, as is thought by the

Mormons, baptism had been vicariously performed on others ;— would raise those, I say, who were baptized into this belief, to the enjoyment of heaven and eternal life, if they were faithful to the heavenly calling ; and that this statement, and all the facts and circumstances connected with it, distinctly show that the baptism of the text is referable, in its benefits and consequences, alone to the living, consciously baptized.

They very erroneously suppose that the Apostle, in his letter to the Romans, 6 : 3 & 4, recognizes the baptism of the dead in the following words : " Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized 'into his death' ? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death : that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

The plain import of the Apostle in these words, is this : *To be baptized into Christ*, is to receive the doctrine of Christ crucified, and to receive baptism as the proof of the genuineness of that faith, and the obligation to live according to its precepts.

Baptized into his death. That is, as Jesus Christ, in his crucifixion, died completely, so that no spark of the *natural* or *animal* life remained in his body, so those who profess his religion should be so completely *separated and saved from sin* that they have no more connection with it, and no more influence from it, than a *dead man* has with or from his departed spirit. As there can be no misunderstanding this clear and yet strong language of the Apostle, and as this stands directly opposed to the supposed doctrine under consideration, and as my text is the only one in the Bible which gives any apparent countenance to such a practice, and, as I think I have shown, this doctrine is not taught in my text, it follows that this notion is not supported by Scripture or reason. And it is unnecessary for me to attempt to prove that whatever supposed religious notion we may entertain, that is both unreasonable and unscriptural, must be as dangerous as erroneous. A few questions on this doctrine.

1. How can the departed believe in person, when their bodies lie mouldering back to dust ?
2. How can the living kinsman know whether the departed spirit believes the gospel or rejects it ?
3. What degree of relationship is necessary to make the proxy valid ?
4. Suppose the survivor hopes that the wicked spirit has believed the gospel, and is baptized in its behalf ; when in *fact* the *unjust* is *UNJUST still* ; of what advantage is the rite to either party ? If none, who can estimate the wickedness of thus mocking God and religion ?

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—“ And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor.” Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—“ For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—“ For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.”

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—“ And behold I come quickly ; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be.” Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—“ These shall go away into everlasting punishment.” This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—
 "And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion and denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—"And behold I come quickly ; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3: 8)—"And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5: 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6: 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22: 12—"And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25: 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—“ And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor.” Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—“ For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—“ For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.”

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—“ And behold I come quickly ; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be.” Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—“ These shall go away into everlasting punishment.” This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—
 "And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—"And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—“And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor.” Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—“For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—“For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.”

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—“And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be.” Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—“These shall go away into everlasting punishment.” This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time, and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3: 8)—"And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5: 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6: 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22: 12—"And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25: 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not, according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3: 8)—"And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5: 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion and denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6: 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22: 12—"And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25: 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.

I shall now present you a few passages of Scripture which must settle this question beyond a doubt. The wise man says, Eccl. 9 : 10, "There is no work (by which thou mayest profit,) nor device, (by which thou mayest escape punishment,) nor knowledge, (of any means of help,) nor wisdom, (no restoration of the soul to the favor and image of God), in the grave whither thou goest." Here then, in the grave, there is no work, or restoration of the soul from the consequences of sin, to the image and favor of God, either by person or proxy. John says, 5 : 28, 29—"All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here you will perceive that their *own* deeds done in *time* fix their condition.

In the Acts, 24 : 15, we read—"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Mark the wording ! Both of the *just* and *unjust*. Now, according to my first quotation and remarks, this justification could not be procured after death, either by person or proxy. How then are they justified ? The Apostle has already signified the mode, both in my text and elsewhere, viz : justification by faith in the doctrines of Christ, unto which doctrine the apostle says, in my text, they were baptized.

Daniel, 12 : 2, says—"And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The same principle is seen, and holds good in this as in the previous passage. The Apostle Paul, speaking to his Roman brethren of the righteous judgment of God, says—

"God will render to every man according to his deeds : tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good."—Rom., 2 : 6, 7.

Job says, 34 : 11—"For the work of a man shall he (God) render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." Not by proxy baptism after death, but by individual faith in God, and good works.

God says, by the mouth of the Prophet Ezek., 34 : 20—"O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after (according to) his ways."

The advocates of this doctrine would try to make us believe that these passages refer to actions of men in this world, and have no applicability to the state of the dead. These we say *are* applicable and immediately to the point, from the facts already elicited, viz : man's happiness, both for time and eternity, depends not upon a faith by proxy, not by good works done by proxy after death, not by proxy baptism for the dead, but by a personal obedience to the law of God, in this life.

But, will you hear Math., 16 : 27, touching this question ? "For

the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works"—and not according to the works of supererogation by others, and that even after death.

Hear the Apostle again, touching this matter, (1 Cor., 3 : 8)—"And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Not according to the labors of others either before or after death. Again he says, (2 Cor., 5 : 10)—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It appears his former thought touching this theme is here amplified, and so distinctly stated, that the advocate of vicarious baptism must be forever silenced, unless he adopt his usual mode of argumentation—*assertion* and *denial*. St. Paul says to his Galatian brethren, (Gal. 6 : 8)—"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

This does not harmonize with the doctrine of the *baptism for the dead*, for that says they may reap of the spirit when they have sown to the flesh. For, those for whom vicarious baptism is offered, sowed to the flesh, and are under condemnation,—and it is to rescue them from this condemnation, that living friends are baptized for their supposed salvation. It is easy therefore to see that this conflicts both with reason and scripture.

Listen now to the Revelator, Rev., 22 : 12—"And behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as *his* work shall be." Not as *others* works shall be in the form of *baptism for the dead*, or any other deed that one person may perform for the departed. This is as ridiculous as the restoration of a sinful papist from purgatory, through perquisites, burning tapers and priestly invocations.

Matthew, 25 : 46, says, with reference to all those who die without an interest in the blood of the everlasting covenant—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This fixes their doleful station where the baptism of living friends can never reach their case. How awful then to trifle, or rather to wrest Divine truth to our own destruction, and mock the Giver of all good. May God help us clearly to see, understand and obey His blessed truth, that we may be baptised with the Spirit and the Holy Ghost, and be prepared for a happy and triumphant death, and glorious immortality beyond the grave.